DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 314 TM 027 790

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Clements, Barbara S.; Blank, Rolf K. |
| TITLE | What Do We Know about Education in the States: Education Indicators in State Reports. |
| SPONS AGENCY | National Center for Education Statistics (ED), Washington, DC. |
| PUB DATE | 1997-03-00 |
| NOTE | 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997). |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC02 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Academic Achievement; *Accountability; *Comparative Analysis; Data Analysis; *Data Collection; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Performance Factors; *Research Reports; *State Programs |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Educational Indicators |

ABSTRACT

Nearly all the states produce one or more accountability or indicator reports containing data reported at one or more levels of the education system as well as data from other sources. To inform discussion about what data are useful and appropriate to report, comparisons were made of state accountability and indicator reports. A list of 74 indicators was prepared that reflected indicators commonly used in 25 national and international indicator reports. Over 100 reports from 45 states, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Dependents Schools were reviewed. Of the 47 states, 37 reported data on average subject area proficiencies by 1 or more grade levels, 33 states reported information about graduation rates, and 37 states reported dropout rates. Also frequently reported are financial data about per pupil expenditures and expenditures by function. This report does not vouch for the quality of any data reported. A major conclusion from this study is that indicators that appear to be the same on the surface, and even have the same name, can, in fact, be very different and can answer different questions. It is a good idea for a state or district that wants to establish indicators to review current practices in schools and districts before determining what indicators to collect and report. (Contains four tables.) (SLD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 414 314

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Barbara Clements
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

# WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT EDUCATION IN THE STATES? EDUCATION INDICATORS IN STATE REPORTS

Barbara S. Clements
Rolf K. Blank

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

Chicago, Illinois
March 1997

TM027790

Barbara S. Clements
Evaluation Software Publishing, Inc.
3504 Holly Street
Alexandria, VA 22305-1949

Rolf K. Blank
Council of Chief State School Officers
One Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 200
Washington, DC 20001-1431



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Portions of the work for this paper were supported by a contract of the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics to the Council of Chief State School Officers. The opinions expressed in this paper are the opinions of the authors, and no endorsement of the sponsoring agencies should be inferred.

# WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT EDUCATION IN THE STATES? EDUCATION INDICATORS IN SEA REPORTS

Barbara S. Clements
Rolf K. Blank

Currently, nearly all of the states produce one or more accountability or indicator reports. These reports contain data reported at one or more levels of the education system (state, district, or school), as well as data obtained from other sources, such as state departments of health and human resources and the U.S. Census Bureau. Many of these reports are patterned after the National Education Goals Panel's annual *Goals Report.* Data reported include student enrollments, graduation rates, dropout rates, assessment scores, and other demographic and performance data.

The purposes of these reports vary; some are a part of mandated reporting requirements by state legislatures and state boards of education, while others are to inform the public. Some reports contain data used to identify districts or schools needing assistance to improve student learning. In other instances, schools and districts received rewards for performance indicated in these reports.

Chief state school officers and others working on the indicator reports have recognized the importance of choosing indicators "about the status or health of the educational system that can be readily, reliably, and repeatedly obtained."[1] In the February 1997 Report to the State Board, Marc Hull, Education Commissioner in Vermont wrote, "Education isn't a contest and data shouldn't be used to set up competitions with winners and losers, rather it should be used to start conversations within communities." (P. 1)

In an effort to inform deliberations about what are useful and appropriate data to report about schools, districts, and states, comparisons were made of these state accountability/indicator reports. This paper summarizes the results of those comparisons.

## Methods

State education agencies were asked to describe accountability and indicator reports produced for the 1994-95 and the 95-96 school years. In addition, they were asked to send copies of their accountability or indicator reports to the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Information about these reports was summarized in 1995 and 1996 in documents titled State Education Accountability Reports and Indicator Reports: Status of Reports Across the States produced by the CCSSO State Education Assessment Center. These summary reports contain information about the level of statistics reported, whether or not the reports are mandated, target audiences and other information.

---

[1] Committee for School Indicators, Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents. (1991) The Case for Local School Indicators. Author. P. i.

Review of the accountability/indicator reports was done by staff of the National Elementary/Secondary Education Data and Information System (NESDIS) Project at CCSSO. NESDIS staff were working with the Core Data Task Force of the National Forum on Education Statistics to identify a set of essential data elements that should be included in all education information systems and that could be used to create indicators of education system functioning. As a part of this project, staff reviewed over one hundred reports received from state and local education agencies in 45 states, the District of Columbia and the Department of Defense Dependents Schools published since 1991. For each report, we noted the following things: 1) mandated or not, 2) cycle (e.g., annual), 3) level of statistics reported, 4) alignment with National Education Goals, 5) whether or not comparisons are made (e.g., with other states, the U.S. average), and 6) if data are reported from sources other than schools (e.g., health statistics, SAT scores). When reports for more than one year were available, we looked at changes in reporting over the years. For some of the more common indicators, we attempted to review definitions used in computing the indicators to see if they were comparable from state to state.

To help organize the review of state-reported indicators, we used a listing of 74 generically stated indicators which appeared in numerous national and state indicators reports. This list was compiled from a review of 25 national and international indicator reports. We defined indicators as the aggregate counts or computed rates that provide information about groups of students, teachers, schools, and districts. Indicators are used to answer questions about the status, functioning, and performance of the unit reported. For each state, we noted if they had the indicator stated exactly as the generic indicator, or if it was an approximate match. Since the goal was to identify commonly occurring indicators, having an exact match was not considered essential. The state summary table included in this document does not provide information for each state about whether or not the indicator is an exact match, that is, is defined the same.

**Results**

Status of State Education Accountability and Indicator Reports

In 1995, 45 states and the District of Columbia indicated they produced at least one annual accountability or indicator report and 24 states indicated that they produced two or more reports. In 1996, the number of states producing accountability or indicator reports increased to 49 (including the District of Columbia), of which 30 produced two or more reports. In 1996, only Minnesota and Wyoming indicated they do not produce reports; however, data usually included in these types of reports was found on their World Wide Web sites. Nebraska indicated that the local school districts were required to produce reports, not the state; but a written statistical report was actually published by Nebraska for the 1995-96 school year, perhaps after our survey was completed. Between 1995 and 1996, three states began producing accountability/indicator reports (Arkansas, Montana, and South Dakota); nine states increased the number of reports produced (Georgia, Kansas, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio, Utah, Vermont, and West Virginia); while one state, Oklahoma, appeared to have reduced the number of reports produced from six to three.

In 1995, 41 states indicated that they reported district-level indicators, and 36 states

reported school-level indicators; whereas, in 1996, 45 states reported data at the district level, and 37 states reported data are the school level. In 1995, 36 states indicated that at least one of their reports were mandated, while in 1996, 38 states produced mandated reports

States varied in how many printed reports were produced. Some states produced large number of reports for distribution to districts, principals, teachers, legislators, and the public; other states produced only enough to distribute to schools and districts. Several states indicated that they are now providing the data through the Internet (Indiana, Maine, Michigan, and Pennsylvania). A review of state home pages on the Internet indicated that 30 of the 49 states with web sites have at least some data listed on their home pages that might typically be included in an accountability/indicator report. (The South Dakota Department of Education and Cultural Affairs' web site could not be located.) Three additional states had sections under development to list school, district, or state data.

Thus it appears that the demand or perceived need for published data about schools and school districts seems to be growing, and states are finding it useful to put these data on the Internet as well as in published documents.

Contents of State Indicators Reports

The review of state indicator reports was focused around the 74 indicators occurring most frequently in national and international indicator reports. The following table, titled *Education Indicators*, contains the listing of the generic indicators obtained from the review of national and international reports. For each generic name of an indicator, an attempt has been made to determine if state education agencies have reported data on the indicator in one or more of their indicator reports between 1991-1995.

In this table it can be seen that 37 of the 47 states reported data on average subject area proficiencies by one or more grade levels (such as NAEP or state assessment scores). Thirty-three states reported data about graduation rates, and 37 states reported drop-out rates. Also frequently reported are financial data about per pupil expenditures and expenditures by function. On the other hand, no states reported data about the percent of children receiving routine health care or about the number of vandalism occurrences in schools.

States obtain data from many sources, but primarily from schools and school districts. Some states report data obtained from the state's office of vital statistics, the Census Bureau and other agencies or organizations. One cannot tell from this table where the data came from, merely that the state included data on the indicator in a published report and at some level (state, school district or school).

The number of exact matches added to the number of approximate matches does not always equal the total number of states reporting. This is because some states provided more than one indicator report. Therefore, a state may have an exact match of an indicator on one report and an approximate match on the same indicator in another report.

The second table, titled *Background and Process Indicators*, contains a list of the 17 most frequently occurring background and process indicators in state education agency reports. For each state whose recent indicator reports were reviewed, the word "yes" indicates that the indicator or a similar indicator occurred in one or more of that state's indicator reports that we

reviewed. Similarly, the third table, titled *Outcome Indicators*, contains a list of the 12 most frequently occurring outcome indicators in state education agency indicator reports. Once again, an indication is provided if the indicator or a variation of it appears in one or more of the state's indicator reports.

A comparison was also done of the formulas/definitions used to compute graduation rates included in the state reports or described by states in documentation sent to CCSSO. It is inappropriate to compare data across states if the formulas or definitions used to collect data are different. In addition, it is useful to review how states are computing data if a state or district is considering the most appropriate way to report data. The following table, titled *Comparisons of Graduation Rate Formulas*, shows the three main ways states compute graduation rates, if they compute them. Of the 35 states for whom we had information, 14 states compute a cohort graduation rate, six states compute a leaver graduation rate, and seven states compute a twelfth grade event rate. Fourteen states indicated they do not compute graduation rates. Reviewing this information is useful in considering whether to promote a single method of computing graduation rates so that comparisons can be made. This information can serve as a warning to any group seeking to develop cross-state graduation rate comparisons using existing data, because comparisons of the rates would be spurious and unfair.

**Conclusions**

The information included in this paper was originally produced for two reasons. The status of state accountability and indicator reports information was collected and published so that states, districts, or others interested in indicators could learn more about what states are doing and find out how to get copies of the documents. The lists of indicators and whether or not states report them were produced to summarize what indicator data are currently collected and reported by states, and to inform decision-making about a useful set of indicators to report on public education. Together, these two sets of information provide a description of what data are being collected by state education agencies for the purpose of informing the public or addressing reporting mandates.

We cannot vouch for the quality or comparability of the data collected from schools, districts, and other sources within or across state lines. However, quality and comparability are essential if schools and districts (or states) are to be compared so that rewards or punishments can be administered or if consistency and improvements over time are to be measured. In addition, it is important to ensure that legislators and the public are not deceived because the data are not comparable. We have learned through our work that indicators that appear to be the same on the surface, that is they are named the same, can actually be very distinct, and answer very different questions. Thus, it is a good idea for a state or district wanting to establish indicators to review what are current practices in schools and districts, and even other states, before determining what indicators to collect and report, how to define the indicators, and when to collect the data.

| 74db# | Domain | Generic Name | # Exact Matches | # Approximate Matches | Total # States Reporting |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0020 | Background | % of children with limited English proficiency | 11 | 6 | 13 |
| 0030 | Background | % of children with a home language other than English | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| 0080 | Background | % of children by family type | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 0081 | Background | % of babies with low birth weight | 5 | 4 | 7 |
| 0085 | Background | % of children receiving recommended immunizations | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 0086 | Background | % of children receiving routine health care | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0090 | Background | Highest level of education completed by parents/guardians | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 0100 | Background | % of families with children receiving public assistance | 0 | 23 | 23 |
| 0110 | Background | Poverty status of the community | 1 | 12 | 12 |
| 0120 | Background | % of children living in severely distressed neighborhoods | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0130 | Background | Average family income (scaled) | 5 | 13 | 15 |
| 0140 | Background | % of mothers receiving prenatal care | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 0145 | Background | % of students enrolled having preschool experiences | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 0405 | Background | % of students enrolled by subject area by course title by grade level | 8 | 15 | 18 |
| 0406 | Background | Mobility rate for students | 6 | 11 | 14 |
| 0548 | Background | % of students by race/ethnicity by gender | 8 | 27 | 31 |
| 0625 | Background | % of students receiving special services (English as a Second Language, Special Education, Title I) | 9 | 25 | 29 |
| 0626 | Background | % of students employed by number of hours/week by age | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0170 | Outcomes | % of students taking AP courses by subject area by grade level | 7 | 4 | 10 |
| 0190 | Outcomes | % of students scoring 3+ on AP tests | 9 | 7 | 14 |
| 0200 | Outcomes | Average subject area proficiencies by grade level (e.g., NAEP) | 27 | 29 | 38 |
| 0205 | Outcomes | % of students meeting state and local achievement standards by school,income,grade level,R/E,etc | 27 | 11 | 29 |
| 0206 | Outcomes | Average scores on college entrance exams | 35 | 9 | 37 |
| 0229 | Outcomes | % students taking specified core curr. (e.g., 4 Math, 3 Sci, 4 English | 2 | 8 | 9 |
| 0230 | Outcomes | % of students graduating from high school | 32 | 11 | 34 |
| 0240 | Outcomes | % of students graduating with a certificate of completion | 10 | 5 | 14 |

| 74db# | Domain | Generic Name | # Exact Matches | # Approximate Matches | Total # States Reporting |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0250 | Outcomes | % of students completing high school equivalency requirements | 9 | 9 | 17 |
| 0255 | Outcomes | % of students who dropped out | 39 | 9 | 39 |
| 0280 | Outcomes | % HS grads enrolled in postsec ed by institution type (2-/ 4-yr/ VocEd) immediately after graduation | 8 | 11 | 14 |
| 0300 | Outcomes | Employment rate for recent high school graduates who did not go on to college | 1 | 8 | 9 |
| 0305 | Outcomes | % of students taking college entrance exams | 28 | 5 | 30 |
| 0307 | Outcomes | Absenteeism rate for students | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| 0545 | Outcomes | Student attendance rate by type of program | 28 | 9 | 30 |
| 0546 | Outcomes | % of students enrolled by type of program | 16 | 20 | 27 |
| 0547 | Outcomes | Average number of hours spent in extracurricular activities | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 0306 | Process | # of students obtaining in-school coop worksite placements | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0400 | Process | % of students suspended or expelled as a disciplinary action | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| 0410 | Process | % of students receiving selected instructional practices by subject | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 0430 | Process | # of articulation agreements that meet TechPrep standards | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0450 | Process | Average class size by subject area | 11 | 2 | 12 |
| 0460 | Process | # of courses taught by multiple teachers/staff | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0465 | Process | # of courses taught jointly by academic and occupational education teachers | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0480 | Process | Adult/child ratio of preschool, kindergarten, and elementary programs | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 0490 | Process | Teacher/student ratio by program type or by subject area or by grade level | 27 | 8 | 27 |
| 0500 | Process | Average # of hours/week spent in different subject areas | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| 0520 | Process | Ratio of time spent in core subjects to time in school | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 0530 | Process | # of school days per school year | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| 0540 | Process | Extent of parental involvement in preschool programs and schools | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| 0560 | Process | Graduation requirements (courses and tests by subject area, etc.) | 7 | 3 | 8 |
| 0590 | Process | Student suspension/expulsion/attendance policies | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0600 | Process | # of criminal offense reported by type | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| 0610 | Process | # of vandalism occurrences | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| 74db# | Domain | Generic Name | # Exact Matches | # Approximate Matches | Total # States Reporting |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0620 | Process | Student-counselor ratio | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 0630 | Process | % of students using substances at school by grade level | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 0640 | Process | Characteristics of teaching assignments by school type | 0 | 27 | 27 |
| 0660 | Process | Extent of teacher participation in professional development activities by content and type | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| 0670 | Process | Extent of preservice training by instructional level | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0645 | Resources | % of teachers assigned to teach within field of certification by subject area | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| 0646 | Resources | % of students with a non-certified teacher by subject area | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 0720 | Resources | Per pupil expenditure | 29 | 17 | 35 |
| 0725 | Resources | Expenditure by function | 23 | 25 | 34 |
| 0750 | Resources | Average salary by staff type by level of experience | 7 | 29 | 30 |
| 0760 | Resources | % of staff by race/ethnicity and/or by sex | 5 | 20 | 22 |
| 0770 | Resources | % of staff who can speak a non-English language by language | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0775 | Resources | Revenue by source | 21 | 24 | 31 |
| 0780 | Resources | Availability of support services for students | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| 0790 | Resources | Extent of school and community coordination by service type | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0870 | Resources | Rate of staff turnover by instructional level | 10 | 4 | 11 |
| 0880 | Resources | # of teaching positions filled with non-certified personnel | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 0890 | Resources | Teacher education by subj area by grade level | 17 | 19 | 27 |
| 0896 | Resources | Extent of usage of computers during instruction | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 0897 | Resources | % of students with access to computers in school by grade level | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 0898 | Resources | # of students per academic computer | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 0899 | Resources | % of teachers with access to computers in school | 0 | 1 | 1 |

| Generic Name | AL | AK | AZ | AR | CA | CO | CT | DE | DC | DoDEA | FL | GA | HI | ID | IL | IN | IA | KS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % of children with limited English proficiency | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | - |
| % of families with children receiving public assistance | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes |
| Poverty status of the community | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - |
| Average family income (scaled) | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - |
| Mobility rate for students | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | - |
| Average class size by subject area | yes | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - |
| Teacher/student ratio by program type, subject area, or grade level | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| % of students enrolled by type of program | yes | - | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - |
| % of students by race/ethnicity by gender | - | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| % of students receiving special services (English as a Second Language, Special Education, Title I) | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes |
| Per pupil expenditure | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| Expenditure by function | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| Average salary by staff type by level of experience | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| % of staff by race/ethnicity and/or by gender | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| Revenue by source | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - |
| Rate of staff turnover by instructional level | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - |
| Teacher education by subject area by grade level | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |

| Generic Name | KY | LA | ME | MD | MA | MI | MN | MS | MO | MT | NE | NV | NH | NJ | NM | NY | NC | ND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % of children with limited English proficiency | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - |
| % of families with children receiving public assistance | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - |
| Poverty status of the community | yes | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - |
| Average family income (scaled) | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mobility rate for students | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - |
| Average class size by subject area | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - |
| Teacher/student ratio by program type, subject area, or grade level | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | - | - |
| % of students enrolled by type of program | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| % of students by race/ethnicity by gender | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | - |
| % of students receiving special services (English as a Second Language, Special Education, Title I) | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | - |
| Per pupil expenditure | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| Expenditure by function | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| Average salary by staff type by level of experience | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| % of staff by race/ethnicity and/or by gender | - | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes |
| Revenue by source | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| Rate of staff turnover by instructional level | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | yes |
| Teacher education by subject area by grade level | - | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes |

| Generic Name | OH | OK | OR | PA | RI | SC | SD | TN | TX | UT | VT | VA | WA | WV | WI | WY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % of children with limited English proficiency | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - |
| % of families with children receiving public assistance | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - |
| Poverty status of the community | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - |
| Average family income (scaled) | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - |
| Mobility rate for students | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - |
| Average class size by subject area | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - |
| Teacher/student ratio by program type, subject area, or grade level | yes | - | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | yes |
| % of students enrolled by type of program | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes |
| % of students by race/ethnicity by gender | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | - | yes |
| % of students receiving special services (English as a Second Language, Special Education, Title I) | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - |
| Per pupil expenditure | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes |
| Expenditure by function | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| Average salary by staff type by level of experience | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | yes |
| % of staff by race/ethnicity and/or by gender | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Revenue by source | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - |
| Rate of staff turnover by instructional level | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Teacher education by subject area by grade level | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - |

| Generic Name | AL | AK | AZ | AR | CA | CO | CT | DE | DC | DoDEA | FL | GA | HI | ID | IL | IN | IA | KS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % of students scoring 3+ on AP tests | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - |
| Average subject area proficiencies by grade level (e.g., NAEP) | - | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| % of students meeting state and local achievement standards by school,income, grade level,etc | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| Average scores on college entrance exams | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| % of students graduating from high school | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | yes | yes | yes | - | - |
| % of students graduating with a certificate of completion | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | - |
| % of students completing high school equivalency requirements | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - |
| % of students who dropped out | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| % HS grads enrolled in postsec ed by institution type (2-/ 4-yr/ VocEd) immediately after graduation | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - |
| % of students taking college entrance exams | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - |
| % of students enrolled by subject area by course title by grade level | yes | - | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - |
| Student attendance rate by type of program | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |

| Generic Name | KY | LA | ME | MD | MA | MI | MN | MS | MO | MT | NE | NV | NH | NJ | NM | NY | NC | ND |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % of students scoring 3+ on AP tests | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | - |
| Average subject area proficiencies by grade level (e.g., NAEP) | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| % of students meeting state and local achievement standards by school,income, grade level,etc | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| Average scores on college entrance exams | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| % of students graduating from high school | - | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| % of students graduating with a certificate of completion | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - |
| % of students completing high school equivalency requirements | - | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - |
| % of students who dropped out | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| % HS grads enrolled in postsec ed by institution type (2-/ 4-yr/ VocEd) immediately after graduation | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - |
| % of students taking college entrance exams | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - |
| % of students enrolled by subject area by course title by grade level | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - |
| Student attendance rate by type of program | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - |

| Generic Name | OH | OK | OR | PA | RI | SC | SD | TN | TX | UT | VT | VA | WA | WV | WI | WY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % of students scoring 3+ on AP tests | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | - | - | yes | - |
| Average subject area proficiencies by grade level (e.g., NAEP) | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - |
| % of students meeting state and local achievement standards by school,income, grade level,etc | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - |
| Average scores on college entrance exams | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | yes |
| % of students graduating from high school | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| % of students graduating with a certificate of completion | - | - | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | - | - |
| % of students completing high school equivalency requirements | - | - | - | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | yes |
| % of students who dropped out | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| % HS grads enrolled in postsec ed by institution type (2-/ 4-yr/ VocEd) immediately after graduation | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | yes | - |
| % of students taking college entrance exams | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | yes |
| % of students enrolled by subject area by course title by grade level | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - | - | yes | yes | - | yes | - | yes | yes | - |
| Student attendance rate by type of program | yes | - | - | - | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | - | - | - | - | yes | yes | - |

Comparisons of Graduation Rate Formulas

| Formulas: | Alabama | Alaska | Arizona | Arkansas | California | Colorado | Connecticut | Delaware | District of Columbia | Florida | Georgia | Hawaii | Idaho | Illinois |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cohort Rate**<br>Total completers or graduates divided by ninth graders 4 years earlier | | | | | X | X | X | X | | X | | | | X |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Leaver Graduation Rate**<br>Total completers or graduates divided by graduates + drop outs over 4 years | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Twelfth Grade Event Rate**<br>Number of graduates divided by the 12th grade beginning enrollment for the same year. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Does Not Calculate a Graduation Rate** | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Comparisons of Graduation Rate Formulas

| Formulas: | Indiana | Iowa | Kansas | Kentucky | Louisiana | Maine | Maryland | Massachusetts | Michigan | Minnesota | Mississippi | Missouri | Montana | Nebraska |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cohort Rate**<br>Total completers or graduates divided by ninth graders 4 years earlier | | | | | | X | X | | | X | | X | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Leaver Graduation Rate**<br>Total completers or graduates divided by graduates + drop outs over 4 years | X | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Twelfth Grade Event Rate**<br>Number of graduates divided by the 12th grade beginning enrollment for the same year. | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Does Not Calculate a Graduation Rate** | | X | | | X | | | X | | | | | X | |

Comparisons of Graduation Rate Formulas

| Formulas: | Nevada | New Hampshire | New Jersey | New Mexico | New York | North Carolina | North Dakota | Ohio | Oklahoma | Oregon | Pennsylvania | Rhode Island | South Carolina | South Dakota |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cohort Rate**<br>Total completers or graduates divided by ninth graders 4 years earlier | | | | | X | X | X | | | | | | X* | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Leaver Graduation Rate**<br>Total completers or graduates divided by graduates + drop outs over 4 years | | | | | | | X | X | | | | X | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Twelfth Grade Event Rate**<br>Number of graduates divided by the 12th grade beginning enrollment for the same year. | | | | | | | X | | | | | | X | X |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Does Not Calculate a Graduation Rate** | X | X | | X | | | | | | X | X | | | |

*South Carolina uses a first grade cohort and an eighth grade cohort.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Comparisons of Graduation Rate Formulas

| Formulas: | Tennessee | Texas | Utah | Vermont | Virginia | Washington | West Virginia | Wisconsin | Wyoming |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cohort Rate**<br>Total completers or graduates divided by ninth graders 4 years earlier | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| **Leaver Graduation Rate**<br>Total completers or graduates divided by graduates + drop outs over 4 years | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| **Twelfth Grade Event Rate**<br>Number of graduates divided by the 12th grade beginning enrollment for the same year. | | | X | | | | | X | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| **Does Not Calculate a Graduation Rate** | X | X | | | | | X | | X |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE